Target Date: Resubmittal to City – October 16, 2020

ltem	Response	Responsible Party
Zoning Ordinance and Scottsdale Revise Code Significant Issues		
Zoning		
1. Please provide an update regarding the status of the Existing Conditions Documentation, Existing Building Assessment, Building Code Analysis, and the Preliminary Historic Preservation Plan as mentioned in the response to Comment #1 in the 1 st review letter. Please Note: The determination of the Haver Building property to be designated Historic Preservation or not will have impacts on the framework of the PBD district development standards as it relates to preservation of the existing improvements on the property.	Regarding the status of the Historic Preservation Consultant Ryden Architects, the 'Existing Conditions Documentation' Final Report is currently under review by the project team. Report is very comprehensive and thorough at documenting the existing 1962 Triangle Building including drawings, 3d model, and descriptive narrative. 'Existing Building Assessment' and 'Building Code Analysis' has been underway for a few short weeks and in parallel with the existing documentation. Project Team anticipates that these two documents will be completed very shortly. This week additional field forensic work and findings about the existing structure will inform such reports. 'Preliminary Historic Preservation Plan' is also underway, and the earlier/current services are invaluable at helping guide this plan; and should be completed within a month.	PEG
2. The response to Comment #10 in the 1 st review letter states that the Total Construction Cost Estimate for the proposed special improvements for requested bonuses is underway. Please provide an update to the application and development agreement (4-DA-2020) that provides this information in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 7.1200.C.4.	Cost estimate breakdown included with resubmittal.	PEG
3. The response to Comment #12 in the 1 st review letter states that "The parking structure will be open and accessible to patrons of these uses" and also states "The parking structure will be secured, and access will be controlled through controlled access system". Please provide additional details regarding operation of the parking garage access system. For example, how restaurant and retail patrons gain access into the structure.	Restaurant patrons and guests for both the hotel and residential buildings will access the garage from north parking ramp. All users will be able to exit the parking garage from the north and south parking ramps. See exhibit 21.f keynote 11 and exhibit 21.r keynotes 1 & 2. There are a variety of parking control systems that the project is evaluating to provide both security for residential tenants and hotel guests while providing public access for restaurant patrons and residential guests. One method for providing access to restaurant patrons is to provide a phone at the parking garage	Gensler & PEG

Item	Response	Responsible Party
	entrance that is directly linked to the hostess desk in the restaurant so that staff can permit guests into the parking structure. A second method for providing garage access to restaurant patrons is to strategically locate parking garage security gates within the parking structure so that parking spaces allocated to the restaurant are outstanding the parking control system. A third method for providing garage access to restaurant patrons is to freely allow all guests to enter the parking structure and for patrons to be required to provide a parking validation from the restaurant in order to exist the garage. Regarding residential guests, it is anticipated that a 'callbox' system be installed at each of the parking garage-controlled access locations. This system will allow residential guests to contact the apartment tenant they wish to visit, who will have the ability to permit the guest to access the parking garage. The project team will continue to evaluate each of the options available, and it will implement a system that allows for both security of residential tenants and hotel guest while providing access to restaurant patrons and residential guests.	
4. In response to Comment #13 from the 1 st review letter, the site plan was updated and now calls out a shade structure over the north/south pedestrian connection along the east property line. Please provide details or a section through the walkway to illustrate how the shade structure is situated relative to the sidewalk.	A shade structure is provided at the north/south pedestrian walkway east of the hotel and east of the residential lobby. See exhibits 21.f 1 and 21.f2	Gensler
Circulation		
5. Please revise the site plan to dedicate a minimum 55 feet of right-of-way along the Indian School Road frontage – Minor Arterial, Urban Character, in accordance with DSPM Sec. 5-3.100.	A 55 foot right-of-way has been illustrated. See exhibit 21.f	Gensler
6. Please revise the site driveway on 3 rd Avenue to be designed in conformance with CL-1 or approved alternative designs, COS Standard Detail #2256. The sidewalk shall be continuous across the driveway, in accordance with DSPM Sec. 5-3.200 and Sec. 5-3.205.	Site driveway has been revised per COS Standard Detail #2256. See exhibit 21.f	Gensler

Item	Response	Responsible Party
7. Please revise the site plan so all new site driveways along Indian School Road are designed in conformance with CL-1 or approved alternative designs, COS Standard Detail #2256. The sidewalk shall be continuous across the driveways, in accordance with DSPM Sec. 5-3.200 and 5-3.205.	Site driveways have been revised per COS Standard Detail #2256. See exhibit 21.f	Gensler
8. Comment #33 from the 1 st review letter requires a minimum 8-foot wide sidewalk along the Indian School Road site frontage, separated from the back of curb, or a minimum 10-foot wide sidewalk at the back of curb. There are portions along the frontage that only provide 7 feet of sidewalk with explanation that there are existing conditions that may limit the width in these locations. It appears, per the site plan (21.f), that these areas of the sidewalk and landscaped frontage area are being reconfigured and should be able to accommodate an 8-foot-wide sidewalk. Please revise the site plan to provide the sidewalk with an 8-foot width.	Sidewalk has been revised to 8'-0". See exhibit 21.f	Gensler
9. Please provide additional information and/or coordinate with Traffic Engineering staff regarding Comment #35 from the 1 st review letter. It appears there was no attempt to use owner/tenant information to estimate trips on event days or non-event days or how often events occur.	Coordinated with Traffic Engineering Staff and revised report accordingly.	Lokahi
Drainage 10. The redlined 2 nd review drainage report is available for download in the file exchange. Please submit the revised Drainage Report with the rest of the resubmittal material identified in Attachment A.	Drainage report was revised per redlines from 2 nd review.	SEG
Water and Waste Water		
11. The redlined 2 nd review water and wastewater design reports are available for download in the file exchange. Please submit the revised Water and Waste Water Design Reports with the rest of the resubmittal material identified in Attachment A.	Water and Wastewater reports were revised per redlines from 2 nd review.	SEG
Significant Policy Related Issues		
Site Design		

Item	Response	Responsible Party
12. Please review and address the comments on the "Refuse Plan-COMMENTS ENGINEERING.pdf" document available for download in the file exchange, in response to the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 2-1.309.	Refuse plan and waste management requirements have been reflected in the revised Refuse Plan. Per a virtual conference meeting with the Solid Waste Department, refuse calculations have been revised, storage and staging of refuse/recycle containers will occur inside refuse rooms and service yard, and pick-up will occur the area just west of the gate adjacent to the alley. See exhibit 21.h	Gensler